

**PATENT**  
Atty. Dkt. No. 19880-003700 (SEDN/247CIP6)  
Page 6 of 9

**REMARKS**

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed February 20, 2007. In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that claims 23-37 are pending and rejected.

In view of the following discussion, Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, Applicants believe that all of the claims are now in allowable form.

It is to be understood that Applicants, do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the prior art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant response.

***Claims 23-37 are patentable over Coleman in view of Oishi and Ebling under §103***

Claims 23-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,844,620 to Coleman ("Coleman") in view of U.S. Patent 6,779,195 to Oishi ("Oishi") and U.S. Patent 7,150,029 to Ebling ("Ebling").

Applicants' independent claims 23, 28 and 33 each recites:

"a roster comprising a plurality of roster elements, each roster element associated with a corresponding IPG page currently provided to the terminal, each roster element comprising a first field containing a packet identifier (PID) for the corresponding IPG page and one or more additional fields containing additional PIDs for respective regions of the IPG page."

As stated in the Office Action, the combination of Coleman and Oishi fails to disclose at least these features of the roster.

Thus, col. 7, lines 55-63 of Ebling was cited as teaching a program guide system in which a base PID is identified and other PIDs are derived from the base PID and stored in a roster, while col. 6, lines 27-67 and col. 11, line 53-col. 12, line 44 were cited as teaching that the PIDs may be associated with different elements in the page (e.g., page 4 of Office Action). Furthermore, col. 5, lines 4-10, Fig. 2 and col. 4, lines 35-50 of

548092-1

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. 19880-003700 (SEDN/247CIP6)  
Page 7 of 9

Ebling were cited as teaching that the IPG data allows the device to tune to various content sources as well as email, telephone, fax and banking.

Applicants disagree with such characterization of Ebling's teaching.

Although Ebling generally teaches various address descriptors in Figs. 10-13 (col. 6, lines 27-67) -- some of which include PIDs, for identifying different objects or source locations, there is no teaching in the cited sections of Ebling regarding "each roster element associated with a corresponding IPG page currently provided to the terminal, each roster element comprising a first field containing a packet identifier (PID) for the corresponding IPG page and one or more additional fields containing additional PIDs for respective regions of the IPG page," as provided in Applicants' invention.

Instead, all that Ebling teaches is that respective PIDs or other identifiers determined from a Channel Information Table (CIT) and descriptors may be used to identify video, audio, data and sub-picture data (col. 12, lines 5-7). As taught by Ebling, the sub-picture data "contains picture elements associated with programs and channels selectable by a user for viewing, and include multimedia objects, program guides, display commands, subtitling" (col. 11, lines 56-60), among others. However, there is no teaching of the specific features of a roster element, such as being associated with a corresponding IPG page currently provided to a terminal, and having a PID for the corresponding IPG page and one or more additional fields with PIDs for respective regions of the IPG page, as provided in Applicants' claims 23, 28 and 33.

Furthermore, each of claims 23 and 33 also recites:

"if the selected IPG page is currently received, then using the roster to determine the PIDs for the respective regions of the selected IPG page, processing these PIDs to recover the selected IPG page, and presenting the selected IPG page to the viewer, without requesting transmission of the selected IPG page from the headend."

Similar features are also provided in independent claim 28. Since neither Coleman, Oishi nor Ebling teaches the roster elements with PIDs for corresponding IPG pages, there is also no teaching regarding processing these PIDs to recover the selected IPG page, as provided in claims 23, 28 and 33.

Thus, Applicants submit that Ebling fails to bridge the substantial gap between Applicants' invention and the teaching of Coleman and Oishi.

**PATENT**  
Atty. Dkt. No. 19880-003700 (SEDN/247CIP6)  
Page 8 of 9

As such, independent claims 23, 28 and 33 are not obvious over Coleman in view of Oishi and further in view of Ebling, and are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 24-27 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 23 and, thus, inherit the patentable subject matter of claim 23, while adding additional elements and further defining elements. Therefore, claims 24-27 are also patentable over the combination of Coleman and Oishi under §103 for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 23.

Claims 29-32 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 28 and, thus, inherit the patentable subject matter of claim 28, while adding additional elements and further defining elements. Therefore, claims 29-32 are also patentable over the combination of Coleman, Oishi and Ebling under §103 for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 28.

Claims 34-37 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 33 and, thus, inherit the patentable subject matter of claim 33, while adding additional elements and further defining elements. Therefore, claims 34-37 are also patentable over the combination of Coleman, Oishi and Ebling under §103 for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 33.

As such, the Examiner's rejections should be withdrawn.

#### THE SECONDARY REFERENCES

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the Office Action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this Office Action.

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. 19880-003700 (SEDN/247CIP6)  
Page 9 of 9

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and passage of the claims to allowance. If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/16/07



Eamon J. Wall  
Registration No. 39,414  
Attorney for Applicants

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702  
Telephone: 732-530-9404  
Facsimile: 732-530-9808

548092-1